

MEMO ENDORSED

Honorable Edgardo Ramos
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

RECEIVED
SONY PRO SE OFFICE
2022 NOV -7 PM 2:32

WALID HASSAN PLAINTIFF)
Dated: November 17, 2022) Civil Action no: 22 CV 4030
New York, New York)
V.)
THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK)
AND THE CITY OF NEW YORK DEFENDANTS)

Plaintiff's reply to defendant's opposition letter (ECF No. 18)
Plaintiff's request his motion for Monell discovery (ECF No.17) to be construed
as a letter for a pre-motion conference rather than a direct motion

Your Honor:

I, Walid Hassan, the plaintiff in the above-referenced matter

1. Prior to the defendant letter in apposition on Monell Discovery motion (ECF No. 18), Plaintiff was not aware of FRCP 37.2 and individual practices of Judge Edgardo Ramos, section 2(A)(i) , which require the moving party to request informal conference with the court before filling a motion in respect to 26(b)(1), as a result, Plaintiff's requests his motion for Monell discovery to be construed as a letter for a pre-motion conference on Monell discovery, with consideration that any potential motion on Monell discovery is not limited to the discovery requested and mentioned in plaintiff's letter (ECF No. 17)
2. Plaintiff's claims are not time-barred, on July 27, 2015 plaintiff was falsely arrested and falsely imprisoned, and maliciously prosecuted by the defendants, on May 24, 2019 this criminal action and all criminal charges were dismissed as was mentioned in the amended complaint (ECF NO. 10).
 - a. In respect to malicious prosecution claim, plaintiff has initiated this action on May 17, 2022 before the period of 3 years statute of limitations has

(1/2)

elapsed from the termination of the criminal charges on May 24, 2019, therefore this claim is not time-barred

- b. In respect to the false arrest and false imprisonment claim that was initiated on May 17, 2022, plaintiff did not initiate this claims within 3 years normal statute of limitations, however as the plaintiff explained in his amended complaint (ECF No. 10, paragraph 27, page 5-6) that the 3 years statute of limitations for this claim started on May 24, 2019, therefore this claim is not time-barred, same as malicious prosecution claim.
3. Under Rule 26(b), “[a] district court has latitude to determine the scope of discovery.” In re Agent Orange Prod, Liability Litig., 517 F.3d 76, 103 (2d Cir. 2008). Courts utilize this broad discretion to ensure that each party is “afforded meaningful opportunity to establish the facts necessary to support his claim.” In re Agent Orange Prod. Liability litig., 517 F.3d at 103 (citing Long Island Lighting Co. v. Barbash, 779 F.2d 793, 795 (2d Cir. 1985)). Indeed, the very purpose of discovery for all claims “is to provide both parties with information essential to proper litigation of all the facts.” Spencer v. International Shoppes, Inc., 2011 WL 3625582, at *2 (E.D.N.Y. Aug. 16, 2011) (quoting Sackman v. Liggett Group, Inc., 173 F.R.D. 356, 361 (E.D.N.Y. 1997)). As the “right of Litigants to discover and present relevant evidence in civil litigations is given great weight in federal court” Apicella v. McNeil Labs., 66 F.R.D. 78, 82 (E.D.N.Y. 1975)).

For all the reasons states above, Plaintiff request this Honorable Court to construe his motion on Monell discovery (ECF No. 17) as a letter for a pre-motion conference rather than direct motion

Certification: I, Walid Hassan, the Plaintiff in this action, being duly sworn, deposes and says that: I affirm under penalty of perjury under the law of the United States of America that all the above statements to be true to the best of my knowledge, information and belief.

Respectfully submitted

Walid Hassan

Walid Hassan
14-16 30th Road, Apt 3L
Astoria, NY 11102

Dated: 11/07/ 2022

(2/2)